DA
913
P17

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
Chap. 913 Copyright No.
Shelf P17
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

272.

THE

WRONGS OF IRELAND,

FROM

THE INVASION OF HENRY II.

BY

S. W. PALMER.

3/3874

Published by the Author.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS U. S. A.

NEW-YORK:

CASPER C. CHILDS, PRINTER, No. 80 VESEY STREET.

1850.

Deposited in the Clerks Office for the Southern District of New York 1850

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty,

BY S. W. PALMER,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for the Southern District of New-York.

IA913
P17

PREFACE.

The object of this little work, which is rather a compiled than an original one, is to show, in a plain and simple manner, that IRELAND has been ever since the invasion of Henry II, a persecuted and oppressed country; and as such entitled in an eminent degree to the sympathies of all nations, particularly of that one

> "Whose star spangled banner in glory does wave,
> O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

THE AUTHOR.

NEW-YORK, JAN. 1, 1850.

LAWS.

The following extracts from "Hibernicæ Vindicæ," will prove that this oppressed country from the date of the invasion of Henry II, has been almost an uninterrupted scene of warfare, oppression, rapine, and confiscation.

By *law*, the murder of an Irishman was punishable only by a fine, whereas the murder of an Englishman was a capital offence.

Marriage or fosterage with the natives (gossipred) which was a tie of uncommon force, were declared high treason.

Forfeiture of land was the penalty if an Englishman using the Irish language, or Irish customs, or Irish apparel, unless security was given to renounce them.

Heavy penalties were enacted against such of the English as allowed Irishmen to graze their lands.

The property of an Irishman about to depart the country might be seized by an Englishman, who was entitled to one-half as a premium, the other to be forfeited to the king.

An Englishman who was robbed by an Irishman, might reprize himself on the whole stripe to which the offender belonged.

Englishmen who claimed debts as due by Irishmen, might, in corporate towns, without the aid of a magistrate, seize the property of the debtors, if they came within the precints. And there was nothing to prevent the seizure in the case of a pretended, as well as of a real bonafide debt.

Any Englishman, meeting an Irishman, robbing, or going to rob, or coming from robbing, unless he had an Englishman in his company, might kill him and cut off his head, *without trial*, and on bringing the head to the portrief of the town, he was further authorized to levy "with his own hands," and those of

his aiders, two pence for every plough, one penny for every half ploughed land, as well as for every house and property worth forty shillings.

By another law, any man found within the pale with the beard on the upper-lip, which was the Irish custom, might be seized, with his goods, as an Irish enemy, and ransomed as such.

By another law, five of the best men of every stripe were obliged to deliver up all of their surnames, charged with offences, or to answer for the offences themselves.

If any Archbishop or Bishop, promoted an Irishman to the situation of a canon, or to any ecclesiastical situation whatever, he forfeited the whole amount of his living.

In all the Parliament rolls which are extant from the fortieth year of Edward III., when the statutes of Kilkenny were enacted, till the reign of Henry VIII., we find the degenerate and disobedient English called rebels; but the Irish which were not in the King's peace, are called enemies.

All these statutes speak of English rebels and Irish enemies, as if the Irish had never been in the condition of subjects, but always out of the protection of the law, and were, indeed, in worse case than aliens of any foreign realm that was in amity with the crown of England.

For by divers heavy penal laws, the English were forbidden to marry, to make gossips with the Irish, or to have any trade or commerce in their markets or fairs; nay, there was a law made no longer since than the twenty-eighth year of Henry VIII., that the English should not marry with any person of Irish blood, though he had gotten a charter of denization, unless he had done both homage and fealty to the King in the chancery, and were also bound by recognizance with sureties, to continue a loyal subject.

A set of needy adventurers passing over from Britain in a constant succession, made no scruple of enriching themselves by the most unjustifiable methods. There was not a native who could be secure from their rapacity.

LAWS RESPECTING RELIGION.

"I am very sensible that, in pursuing the historical account, I shall have the management of a very difficult province. If a writer cannot divest himself, not only of the humanity of a just and generous Heathen, but of the charity of a Christian, he shall be pursued with the name of a favorer of Popery."—NALSON.

At the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne of England, 1558, the Roman Catholic religion was professed by the Irish nation, with scarcely an exception. There was not one of any other denomination for every ten thousand Catholics. Throughout three-fourths of the Island there was not a Protestant in existence, and the mass of the nation knew not what the word meant. In such a state of things, so utterly inauspicious for her views, Queen Elizabeth, head of the Church of England, conceived the preposterous and unholy design of subjecting the exercise of the Catholic religion in Ireland to the most oppressive penalties and forfeitures, *by act of the Parliament of that country*, in the year 1560.

The following are some of the leading features of this odious act.

1. Any clergyman who refused to use the Common Prayer in his church, or who refused any form of worship, rite, ceremony, or manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper, openly or privily, that was mentioned in the said Book of Common Prayer, was to forfeit all the profit or income of his benefice for one whole year, and also suffer imprisonment for six months.

2. For the second offence, he was to forfeit his income forever, and suffer imprisonment for one year.

3. For the third offence, he was to suffer imprisonment for life.

4. Laymen, for the first offence, were to undergo imprisonment for one year, and the second, imprisonment for life.

5. Any person who dared, by any interludes, plays, songs, rhymes, or by other open words, declare or speak anything in

derogation of the Book of Common Prayer, or interrupt any clergyman in the use of it, for the first offence, was subject to a fine of one hundred marks, for the second four hundred, and for the third offence, was to forfeit all his goods and chattels, and suffer imprisonment for life.

6. Every person in the kingdom absenting himself from the usual place where Common Prayer was used, on Sundays and Holidays was subject to a fine of twelve pence, and to the censures of the Church.

7. By another clause, the Queen, or the Lord Deputy, or other Governor or Governess of Ireland, were authorized, with the advice of Council, to publish such further ceremonies or rites as they might judge proper for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of the Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

Religious persecution is one of the greatest stains attached to human nature. It is in hostility with the most clear and explicit doctrine of Jesus Christ, and its absurdity is about equal to its wickedness; as it supposes what never was, and what never can be, that men can change their belief at will, as they can change their dress. But our opinions are as independent of our volition, except where reason comes in aid of the change, as our complexion or our height. Wherever, or by whomsoever perpetrated, this odious offence and its perpetrators merit the curse of God and man. It makes no difference in the eye of Heaven whether the victim be fined, imprisoned, or immolated at Madrid, in Paris, in London or Dublin. It is a crime for which there never was, nor can be, any apology or extenuation, and which, in a peculiar degree, cries to heaven for vengeance.

That every man has a right, inherent and indefeasible, to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, *provided they do not lead to the commission of crimes*, is one of those eternal maxims to which man, in every clime, unsophisticated by religious establishments, must bear testimony. The time, it is to be hoped, will arrive, when it will be a subject of astonishment, and appear wholly incredible that it could have ever entered into the mind of any human being to coerce the religious opinions of his fellow-men, or that he could have been so supremely wicked as to punish them, with fine, imprisonment, or death, for the conscientious discharge of their religious duties.

It is, I repeat, at all times and in all places, deserving of abhorrence and execration. But it has a peculiar malignity and turpitude when perpetrated by the reformers. To be satisfied of this truth, requires but a small degree of reflection and candor. To elucidate this point, I shall select two nations, France and

England, the former, at the moment when Calvinism was first preached there,—the latter when the reformed religion was established.

At that time, the Roman Catholic religion universally prevailed in France. It rested on the authority of General Councils, composed of bishops and priests, convened from every part of Christendom. Those Councils are, by Catholics, universally believed to be infallible, and their religion is regarded as emanating from Jesus Christ himself, and the same as taught by the Apostles and Disciples. It is wholly foreign from my purpose to discuss the question, whether these opinions were just or the contrary. Whatever decision that question might receive would not, in the slightest degree affect the argument. They believed that all innovations were heresies and schisms, and deserving of punishment. However lamentable and unjustifiable, therefore, it may be, it is not very wonderful that they had recourse to pains and penalties to prevent the spread of what they regarded as pestiferous innovations.

But the case of England was incalculably different. The great basis of the reformation rested on the right of every man to interpret the Scriptures for himself, unfettered by the decrees of Popes, or Councils, or synods. On the Protestant standard was imprinted in conspicuous characters, "Search the Scriptures." There the rule of faith is distinctly developed. The reformers, therefore, having duly searched the Scriptures, abandoned from conscientious motives, the religion of their ancestors and their youth, and chose a religion for themselves, it would appear that nothing but insanity could have led them to suppose that they had any right to control their neighbors' religious opinions, or that their neighbors did not possess an equal right with themselves, either to choose a new religion, or to adhere to the old, as their conscience might prescribe.

Yet, in opposition to the dictates of reason and common sense, the voice of history proclaims that, in England, and indeed, in almost every part of Europe, the Reformers, when possessed of power, persecuted not merely the followers of the old religion,

but even those who, like themselves, had abandoned that religion, but chosen a different system from their own. This is a fertile topic, and I shall only, for the present, refer, for the confirmation of these positions, to the Noyades of Switzerland, the proceedings of the synod of Dort, in Holland, to the horrible persecutions of the Society of Friends, in England, of the Covenanters, in Scotland, by Lauderdale and archbishop Sharp, the latter of which were not exceeded by those of the Vaudoise and Albigenses.

I trust, therefore, it will appear as clear as the noon-day sun, that the persecuting reformer was far more culpable than the persecuting Catholic, odious as the latter undoubtedly was. To the active and inherent turpitude of one of the most hideous crimes—a crime offering outrage to the mild dictates of the religion both descriptions of Christians professed, the former added the grossest inconsistency—the most direct violation of the vital and fundamental principle on which his religion was established.

It hence follows, although, every inquisitor, whether a resident of London, or Madrid, of Lisbon, Glasgow, or Dublin, ought, by the *lextalionis*, to have been scourged by his own lash, hung by his own gibbet, impaled on his own stake, or roasted with his own faggot, that if it were possible to make a scale in which a due proportion should be observed between the crime and punishment, the reforming persecutor might lay claim to a pre-eminence over the Roman Catholic.

The Reformation, whatever may have been its operation in other countries, produced the most deleterious consequences in Ireland. One of the first fruits of it was, to expel the old clergy from the Churches without supplying their places with successors.

Another, was a sacrilegious robbery of the Catholic Churches, which were generally despoiled of their furniture and ornaments, by persons appointed to remove crucifixes, mass-books, and other articles from them. The spoils were publicly sold by the plunderers for their benefit. To this rapine they were encouraged by the hostility openly manifested towards the old Church, by their intolerant rulers. This unholy proceeding was carried to such a profligate length, that it was finally found necessary to pass an act to prevent it.

The following extracts from the contemporary writers, will fully substantiate these statements:

"The garrison of Athlone issued forth with a barbarous fury, and pillaged the famous Church of Clonmacaoise, tearing away the most inoffensive ornaments, books, bells, plate, windows, furniture of every kind, so as to leave the shrine of their favorite St. Kieraw, a hideous monument of sacrilege."—*Leland.*

"Some of them, (the Bishops,) whose dioceses are in remote parts, somewhat out of the world's eye, doe not at all bestow the benefices which are in their own donation upon any, but keep them in their own hands, and set their own servants and horseboys to take up the tithes and fruites of them, with the which some of them purchase great lands, and build faire castels upon the same, upon which abuse, if any question be moved, they have a very seemly color of excuse that they have no worthy ministers to bestow them upon, but keep them so bestowed for any such sufficient person, as any shall bring unto them."—*Spenser.*

"Whatever disorders you see in the Church of England, yee may finde there, and many more, viz.: grosse simony, greedy covetuousnesse, fleshly incontinency, careless sloath, and generally all disoedered life in the common clergyman. And besides all these, they have their particular enormities; for all Irish priests which now enjoy the church livings, they are in manner mere laymen, saving that they have taken holy orders, but otherwise they doe goe and live like laymen—follow all kinds of husbandry and other worldly affairs as other Irishmen doe. They neither read Scripture, nor preach to the people, nor administer the communion; but baptisme they doe; for they christen yet after the Popish fashion, only they take the tithes and offerings, and gather what fruite else they may of their living."—*Ib.*

"It is great wonder to see the oddes which is between the zeale of Popish priests, and the ministers of the Gospel; for they spare not to come out of Spaine, from Rome, from Romes, (Rheims) by long toyle and dangerous travyaling hither, where they know perill of death awayteth them, and no reward or richesse is to be found, only to draw the people unto the Church of Rome;

whereas some of our idle ministers, having, as way for credite and estimation, thereby opened unto them, and having the livings of the countrye offered unto them without paines and without perile, will neither for the same, nor any love of God, nor zeal of religion, or for all the good they may doe by winning souls to God's harvest, which is ever ready for the sickle, and all the fields yellow long ago."—*Ib.*

"The first is, the Churches nowe so spoyled, as well by the ruine of the temples, as the discipacion and imbeascinge of the patrimonye, and most of all, for want of sufficient ministers; as so deformed and overthrown a Churche there is not, I am sure, in any region where Christ is professed, and preposterous it seemeth to me to begin reformacion of the politique parte and to neglect the religious."—*Sydney.*

"I was advertized of the particular estate of each Churche in the bishopricke of Meithe, (Meath)—(being the best inhabited countrie of all this realm,) by the honest, zealous, and learned Bishop of the same, Mr. Hugh Brady, a goodly minister for the Gospel, and a good servant to your highness, who went from churche to churche hym self, and found that there are within his dioces two hundred and twenty-four Churches, of which number one hundred and five are impropriated to sondrie possessions nowe of your highness, and all leased out for years, or in fee farme, rent to severall farmers, and great gayne reaped out of them above the rent which your Majestie receiveth; no parson, or vicar, resident upon any of theim, and a very simple or sorrye curat, for the most part appointed to serve theim, amonge which nomber of curatts, only eighteen were founde abele to speake English."—*Ib.*

"No one howse standinge for any of theim to dwell in. In maney places, the very walles of the churches doune; verie few chauncells covered, wyndowes and dores, ruyned or spoyled. There are 52 other parrishe churches in the same dioces, who have viccars indued upon them, better served and maynteined then the other, yet but badlye. There are 52 parishe churches more, residue of the first nomber of 224, which perteine to dyvers

perticuler lords, and these, though in better estate then the rest commonlye are, yet farre from well. If this be the estate of the churche in the best peopled dyoces, and best governed countrye of this your realme (as in troth it is) easye it is for your majestie to conjecture, in what case the rest is, where little or conformation, either of religion or manners, hath yet bene planted and contynued amonge theme."—*Ib.*

"Uppon the face of the eerthe, where Christ is professed, there is not a churche in so miserable a case; the miserye of whiche consistethe in thiese three perticulars, the ruyne of the verie temples theimselves; the want of good mynisters to serve in them, when they shall be re-edified; competent lyvinge for the mynisbeinge wel chosen."—*Ib.*

"And, though the outrages in the civil government were great, yet nothing to be compared to the ecclesiastical state, for that was too far out of order, the temples all ruined, the parish churches for the most part without curates and pastors, no service said, no God honored nor Christ preached, nor sacraments ministered."—*Hooker upon Hollinshed.*

"There has been so little care taken, as that the greatest part of the Churches within the pale be still in their ruins; so as the common people, (whereof many, without doubt, would conform themselves) have no place to resort to where they may hear divine service."—*Davies.*

"For the holding of two livings and but two with care, since you approve me in the substance I will yield to you in the circumstance of time. Indeed, my lord, I knew it was bad—very bad in Ireland; but, that it was so stark naught I did not believe, six benefits, valuable to find the minister cloths. In six parishes scarce six comes to church."—*Stafford.*

"The best entrance to the cure, will be clearly to discover the state of the patient, which I find many ways distempered; an unlearned clergy, who have not so much as the outward form of churchmen to cover themselves with, or their persons any ways reverenced or protected, the churches unbuilt, the parsonage and vicarage houses utterly ruined; the people, through the non-re-

sidency of the clergy, occasioned by the unlimited shameful numbers of spiritual promotions with care of souls, which they hold by commendams; the rites and ceremonies of the churchs run over without all decency, habit, or gravity, in the course of their service; the possessions of the church to a great proportion, in lay hands; the bishops aliening their principal houses and demises to their children, to strangers, farming out their jurisdiction to mean and unworthy persons; the Popish titulars, exercising the Welsh, a foreign jurisdiction much greater than theirs."—*Ib.*

"There are seven or eight ministers in each dioceses of good sufficiency; and (which is no small continuance of the people in Popery stile,) English, which have not the tongue of the people, nor can perform any divine office, or converse with them; and which hold many of them two or three or more vicarages a piece; even the clerkships themselves are in like manner conferred upon the English, and sometimes two or three or more upon one man, and ordinarily bought and sold or let to farm."—*Barnet's Life of Bedell.*

"As scandalous livings naturally make scandalous ministers the clergy of the established Church were generally ignorant and unlearned, loose and irregular in their lives and conversation, negligent of their cures, and very careless of observing uniformity and decency in divine worship."—*Carte.*

"Nor were the perochial Churches in a better condition than the Cathedrals. They had most of them in the country been destroyed in the troubles, or fallen down for want of covering; the livings were very small, and either kept in the bishop's hands by way of commendams and sequestrations, or else filled with ministers as scandalous as their income, so that scarce any care was taken to catechise the children, or instruct others in the grounds of religion; and for years together divine services had not been used in any parish Church throughout Ulster, except in some city or provincial town."—*Ib.*

"There were few Churches to resort to; few teachers to exhort and instruct; fewer still who could be understood; and almost all, at least for the greater part of the reign (Elizabeth's) of scandalous insufficiency."—*Seland.*

THREE PARTIES IN IRELAND.

"For centuries, between the invasion and the close of the reign of Elizabeth, there was a strong and as marked a line of distinction drawn between the English and the Anglo-Hibernians, as between the latter and the descendants of Heber, Heremon, and Milesius, from whom the Irish Nation originally sprung.—The English regarded the Anglo-Hibernians with as much jealousy, and as strong a disposition to violate towards them the rights of persons and property, as the latter displayed towards the Irish. And the rapine and depredation perpetuated on the Irish by the Anglo-Hibernians, under the sanction of law, was retaliated on the latter by the English. From this view of the subject, it appears that there were two different species of oppression and misgovernment existing in Ireland—one on the part of the English operating on the Anglo-Hibernians and the Irish; and the other of the Anglo-Hibernians on the Irish, the latter groaning under a double yoke, the Anglo-Hibernians under a single one.

The most usual means of accomplishing the nefarious purpose of confiscating estates in Ireland were:

1. By implicating the nobility and gentry in some real or fictitious plot, and citing them to appear before the deputies; if they appeared, seizing them and trying them under martial law, or by a Jury packed for the purpose, or acting under the dread of corporal or other punishment, if their verdict did not quadrate with the views of the Government.

2. If they did not appear, as was often the case, in consequence of the perfidy so frequently experienced by those who ventured to comply with the requisition, regarding their non-appearance as a confession of guilt declaring them traitors, and overrunning and seizing their territories.

Recourse, in both cases, was generally had to acts of attainder, for the confiscation of the estates of the parties.

An act of attainder is a tremendous instrument of persecution and destruction. There are few conceivable cases in which it can be used, without manifest injustice and oppression. As it is enacted by the highest authority in the State, there lies no appeal against its overwhelming operation, however atrociously wicked. The instances of its use in England are not very numerous, and rarely occurred except in times of extreme turbulence and violence, when the voice of reason and justice was drowned in the clamor of faction, cruelty, prejudice, and persecution.—Moreover, acts of attainders were passed only by Parliaments correctly constituted, according to the usual constitutional forms; whereas *in Ireland*, when confiscation was the object in view, the most base, corrupt, and tyrannical measures were adopted to secure such a Parliament as would meet the views of the Government, however unjust, with the most obsequious complaisance.

Acts of attainder were more frequent against the Alglo-Hibernians, than against the Irish. This arose, as I have already stated, from their superior wealth. Had the deluded Anglo-Hibernians acted towards the Irish on principles of justice or equality—had they imparted to them the benefit of English laws, the two races would have coalesced together, and formed a solid phalanx which would have bade defiance to the machination of the swarms of locusts who came over in the train of the deputies and presidents, and whose objects were "to repair their shattered fortunes."

The extent of these depredations, and the temptations they held out to avarice and rapine, may be conceived from the fact that of the estates of the Earl of Desmond, who possessed the largest landed property of any of the noblemen in the English dominions, those who drove him to desperation and finally hunted him him to death, divided among them and their friends, no less than 259,000 acres.

This Earl and his accomplices had forfeited to the crown, es-

tates amounting in all to 574,628 acres, as the list shows. Above one third of them were conveyed to the following persons, leading dependents of the court, at the annual rent of £1,976 7*s.* 5*d.*, being about two pence per acre.

COUNTY.	NAMES	ACRES.
Waterford, - - - -	Sir Christopher Hutton, -	10,910
Waterford and Cork, -	Sir Walter Raleigh, - - -	12,000
Kerry, - - - - -	Sir Edward Dewey, - - -	6,000
Do. - - - - - -	Sir Willliam Herbert, - -	13,276
Do. - - - - - -	Charles Herbert, - - - -	3,768
Do. - - - - - -	John Hally, - - - - -	4,222
Do. - - - - - -	Captain Jenkin Conway, -	526
Do. - - - - - -	John Champion, - - - -	1,434
Cork, - - - - -	Sir William Saint Leger, -	6,000
Do. - - - - - -	Hugh Caff, - - - - -	6,000
Do. - - - - - -	Sir Thomas Norris, - - -	6,000
Do. - - - - - -	Arthur Robins, - - - -	1,800
Do. - - - - - -	Arthur Hide, - - - - -	5,574
Do. - - - - - -	Francis Butcher & Hugh Worth,	24,000
Do. - - - - - -	Thomas Say, - - - - -	3,778
Do. - - - - - -	Arthur Hyde, - - - - -	11,766
Do. - - - - - -	Edmund Spencer, - - -	3,028
Do. and Waterford, -	Richard Beacon, - - - -	6,000
Limerick, - - - -	Sir William Courtney, - -	10,500
Do. - - - -	Francis Berkly, Esq., - -	7,250
Do. - - - -	Robert Anslow, - - - -	2,599
Do. - - - -	Richard and Alex. Fitton, -	3,026
Do. Waterford and Tipperary,	Sir Edward Fitton,	11,515
Do. - - - -	Wm. Trenchard, Esq., - -	12,000
Do. - - - -	George Thornton, Esq., - -	1,500
Do. - - - -	Sir George Bourchier, - -	12,880
Do. - - - -	Henry Billingsley, Esq., - -	11,800
Inverary, - - - -	Thomas, Earl of Ormond, -	3,000

CONFISCATION IN ULSTER.

"Treason does never prosper—what's the reason?
That if it prospers, none dare call it treason."

"The unceasing spoliation perpetrated on the Irish was speciously covered with the mantle of rebellion, which was always within reach. Every act of resistance, of insult, outrage, or aggression, was thus designated in proclamations, and afterwards in histories. The prescription was simple; it had been administered times without number, and never failed of success. It was only to make an inroad, or to commit some depredation on such of the Irish nobility or gentry, as might be selected for the purpose, the more flagrant the better; provoke them to resistance; proclaim them traitors; let the armies loose to destroy them, and then confiscate their estates."

A vast landed property was thus obtained from O'Neil. I find in Debrett's Peerage, the following information of this family: "His Lordship is decended from the ancient princes of Ireland, whose representative, in 1542, was created Earl of Tyrone, by Henry VIII., on disclaiming the title of Prince, and submitting to the English crown. Their family motto is *Tam seaps Empton.** On the shield is a fish naiant, and the red hand. To further the plantation of this district, King James I., instituted the order of Baronets, in 1611, and then limited the number to two hundred, who were to pay into the exchequer as much as would maintain thirty soldiers, at eight pence per day, which amounted to near £1,100. Each Baronet has the privilege of bearing on his shield, in a canton or in a whole escutcheon, the arms of Ulster, viz., in a field argent, a sinister hand gules." I mention this circumstance to correct an error I often hear made,—that those

* The Red Hand of Ireland.

families who have the red hand in their coat have some time or other committed murder. As people do not reflect, this tale passes current, while a little use of common sense would convince them of its fallacy. I should suppose from the time this order first began, there have been two thousand families created, and probably seven hundred of which are now remaining. A precious group of butchers, and very properly marked they would be, if such was the fact.

To proceed with the narrative:—King James I., changed the system, and substituted the fraud of the fox for the force of the lion. He thus acquired six entire counties in the province of Ulster, and five in another.

Pretended plots and conspiracies were easily fabricated; they were not expensive, and succeeded to admiration, so as to render unnecessary the apparatus of a rebellion, which would have obliged the *peace-loving* James to open the doors of the temple of Janus, to which he had an unconquerable aversion. This was the new system.

A letter was dropt in the Castle of Dublin, (then the seat of Government.) The import of this letter was as follows:—It was pretended to be from a Catholic who had been tampered with by the traitors, and whom they had endeavored to seduce into the conspiracy, but whose loyalty rendered him incorruptible. It states: "That he was called into company by some Popish gentlemen, who after administering the oath of *secrecy*, declared their purpose, to murder or poison the Deputy; to cut off Sir Oliver Lambert; to pick up, one by one, the rest of the officers of State; to oblige the small dispersed garrisons, by hunger, to submit, or to pen them up as sheep to their shambles. That the Castle of Dublin, being neither manned nor victualed, they held as their own; that the towns were for them and the country with them, the great ones in the North prepared to answer the first alarm; and that the powerful men in the West are assured by their agents, to be ready as soon as the State is in disorder. That the Catholic King had promised, and the Jesuits from the Pope had warranted, men and means to second the first stirs, and roy-

ally to protect all their actions. That as soon as the State is dissolved, and the King's sword in their hands, they will elect a Governor, Chancellor, and Council; dispatch letters to James I., trusting, from his unwillingness to embark in such a war, and to his facility to pardon, that he would grant their own conditions of peace and government, with toleration of religion; that if the King listen not to their motions, then that the many days spent in England in debates and preparations, would give them time enough to breathe, fortify, and furnish the maritime coasts; and at leisure call to their aid the Spanish forces from all parts." The writer of the letter declares, "that he interposed some doubts on them, which they readily answered; and he pretended to them to consent to their projects, and that he took the method of this letter to give notice of their designs, though he refused to betray his friends; in the meantime, he would use his endeavors to hinder any further practices." And he concludes, "that if they did not desist, though he reverenced the mass and Catholic religion equal to any of them, yet he would make the leaders of that dance know, that he preferred his country's good before their busy and ambitious humors."—*Plowden.*

Every age of the world is characterized by some peculiar folly or wickedness, which distinguishes it from those which have preceded it, as well as from those which follow, with nearly as much accuracy as the varied features of the face distinguishes one man from another.

Any impartial, enlightened reader, called upon to fix the peculiar feature of the seventeenth century, in the wide range of the British dominions, would, without hesitation, pronounce it to have been the age of forgery, perjury, and fabricated plots, contrived for the purpose of overwhelming the innocent in ruin, and enriching the malefactors with their spoils.

It is hardly possible to imagine at the present day, now that the dire passions which actuated so large a portion of the community in England and Ireland during that period, have nearly or wholly subsided, what a number of these contrivances were employed; how regularly they succeeded each other;

what mischievous consequences they produced; and yet how excessively stupid the most of them were. Many of them which were devoured with greedy ears by the great and little vulgar—were so ridiculous, so absurd, and so utterly improbable, that at the present day they would not impose on a gang of swine herds.

Such being the way by which six of the thirty-two counties of which Ireland consisted, was obtained, let us now see how this "Solomon of the age" proceeded, who, as Leland says, "considered himself as the destined reformer and civilizer of a rude people; and was impatient for the glory of teaching a whole nation the valuable arts of life—of improving their lands, extending their commerce, and refining their manners.

There were three divisions made of the spoils. "*First*—to English and Scotch, who are to plant their proportions with English and Scotch tenants. *Second*—to servitors in Ireland who may take English or Irish tenants at their choice. *Third*—to natives of those counties who are to be freeholders."

"That in the surveys, observation be made what proportions, by name, are fittest to be allotted to the Britons, what to the servitors, and what to the natives; wherein respect is to be had that the *Britons* are to be put in places of best safety; the *natives* to be *dispersed*, and the servitors planted in those places which are of greatest importance to serve the rest."

"The said undertakers, their heirs and assigns, shall not alien or demise their portions, or any part thereof, to the *mere Irish*, or to such persons as will not take the oath, which the said undertakers are bound to take, which shall be inserted in their letters patent.

"The said undertakers shall not alien their portions during five years next after the date of their letters patent, but in this manner, viz: one-third part in fee farm; another third part for forty years or under, reserving to themselves the other third part without alienation during the said five years. But after the said five years, they shall be at liberty to alien to all persons except the *mere Irish*, and such persons as will not take the oath.

"The article concerning the servitors is: they shall take the

oath of supremacy, and be conformable in religion as the former undertakers.

"They (the servitors) shall not alien their portions, or any part thereof, to the *mere Irish*, or to any such person or persons as will not take the like oath, which shall be inserted in their patents.

"The sword-men are to be transported into such other parts of the kingdom as, by reason of the waste-land therein, are fittest to receive them, namely: Connaught, and some parts of Munster, where they are to be dispersed, and not planted together in one place; and such sword-men as have not followers, nor cattle of their own, to be disposed of in his Majesty's service."—*Harris's Hibernica.*

The author of "Vindiciæ Hibernicæ," is not content with giving the simple account of this vile affair, (page 180, 2nd edition, 1823,) but makes comparisons about the Dismal Swamp of North Carolina, which is a most outrageous comparison, squaring neither with the latitude nor the longitude, nor the localities of the two countries. There is no such thing as a swamp in all Ireland, in the direful sense an American reader would undrstand it; bogs there are enough, but they are not dismal swamps. The whole Kingdom of Ireland is nearly all of it based on a range of mountain limestone, marble or granite; hence, in the vicinity of the bogs the country is not unhealthy. One can, and ought to make great allowance for an Irishman describing the miseries of his country; but the truth, the whole truth, the simple truth, is best. I by no means intend to lessen the weight of any of his arguments or statements when well grounded, but comparisons may be made to give a view of a question which the facts will not bear.

CIVIL WARS.

"Dat veniam corvis; vexat censura columbas."—*Juvenal.*

He must be a very superficial reader or observer, who requires to be informed how very different the rewards or punishments which in this life are bestowed on acts absolutely similar: or how frequently an act which brings ruin on one man, elevates another to the highest pinnacle of worldly grandeur and prosperity. Instances in illustration of this idea, are of frequent occurrence in public and private life.

> "The ways of Heaven are dark and intricate,
> Puzzled in mazes, and perplexed with errors,
> Our understanding traces them in vain,
> Lost and bewilder'd in the fruitless search."—*Addison.*

The three Kingdoms subject to the crown of England, were the theatres of civil wars almost contemporaneously. The consequence to the actors during their existence, and to their fame with posterity, were as different as light with darkness. The Irish who had every possible justification, on whom had been perpetrated almost every species of outrage—who were goaded into civil war by an uninterrupted series of depredations and oppression, paid a most ruinous forfeit in fortune, and in fame; while those whose grievances were comparatively insignificant, and who, of course, had incomparably less justification, attained, living and dead, the highest honors, and many of them aggrandized themselves in point of fortune and worldly honors, to the full extent of their wishes. This is not exactly as it should be; it is almost too late completely to correct the prevalent errors on the subject—to wash away the foul stains which avarice, religious bigotry, and national rancour impressed upon the sufferers. But though I may not, therefore, fully succeed, yet the attempt to effect these great objects, can hardly be otherwise than useful.

Charles I., a bigot and a despot by education, wickedly endeavored to force a new religion on the Scotch. In this he only followed the examples of his predecessors, Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, who had successively either forced or persuaded their servile Parliaments four times in the course of about thirty years, to make a radical change in the established religion.

Let it be observed, however, that the new religion was not the antipodes of the old one, as had been the case with the changes of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. The new religion bore many kindred features of the old; in points of doctrine they were nearly sisters, although there was a marked difference in the church government. But the difference between the religion which Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth found "*by law established*," and the one they "*established by law*," was incalculably greater than between the religion of Scotland at the accession of Charles I., and the religion he attempted to force on his subjects.

An important consideration must not be passed over here.—The Scotch labored under scarcely any other grievance than the contemplated innovation in their religion; their persons and property were sacred.

They resisted the despotic and wicked interference between them and their Maker. They were perfectly justified in the eyes of Heaven and their fellow-men. It is not given by the living God to any of the sons of men, to force the religious worship of their fellow-men; and the attempt to change religious opinions by legal coercion, is as truly absurd as would be the effort to "change the hue of the dusk Ethiop." Brutal force, as has been observed, may coerce men into an apparent conformity, but it never made a convert yet, and never will: it is fated to produce martyrs or hypocrites.

The evil destiny of Charles induced him to raise forces to subdue the refractory Scotch. They obeyed the first law of human nature—the law of self-preservation. They raised forces to defend themselves, finally triumphed over the aggressor, and extorted from him a grant of every demand they chose to make.

He was totally foiled, and retired from the contest, defeated and overwhelmed with shame and disgrace.

What has been the result as respects the Scotch? They were honored during their lives; were rewarded by the English Parliament with £300,000, and £25,000 monthly for their brotherly assistance,* and now occupy a place in history as men who embarked in a holy cause, and were resolved to die or be free.

MAY 21ST, 1641.

"*Resolved, &c.*—That the whole arrear of £120,000 be presently paid to the Scots, out of which the due debts of the counties are to be deducted, and for the brotherly assistance of £300,000, it shall be settled and secured by the Kingdom to them."—*Nalson.*

"As a testimony of their brotherly affection, the two houses had frankly undertaken to give them a gratuity of £300,000, over and above the £25,000 the month, during the time their stay should be necessary."—*Clarendon.*

Thus, that very Parliament which so rancorously pursued the Irish to their utter ruin, and to the scaffold, for resistance to tyranny, lavished the wealth of their constituents on the Scotch, for similar resistance, without a tenth part of the provocation.

A singular circumstance occurred, on taking the vote for the "brotherly assistance." Mr. Jervase Hollis, in a debate on the best and speediest means of their payment, said "that he knew no better or fitter than by English arms to expel them the Kingdom," was called to the bar, and expelled the house.—*Frankland.*

Times are changed. The Scotch, then such favorites, fell into disgrace in a few years. By a vote of the House of Commons, ten years afterwards, 1,500 of the prisoners of that nation were sold or given away to the Guinea merchants to work in the mines.—*Whitelock.*

* This very extraordinary fact has attracted the attention of few English readers. The money paid to the Scotch on this occasion, is generally confounded with the arrears paid them about five years afterwards, when they delivered Charles I., into the hands of the Parliament, after he had fled to their camp before Newark, on the final downfall of his affairs. This, as appears from the above extract, is a very great error.

In 1642, a civil war broke out in England, on various grounds. Charles I., was, in the first fifteen years of his reign, an arbitrary despot; the proceedings in the Star Chamber Court were both tyrannical and cruel; that the fines in that Court were oppressive, the punishments frequently most barbarous; the exactions of ship-money, tonnage, and poundage, illegal and unjust; and that they required and justified resistance, none but a cringing slave, deserving of the despot's lash, will deny.

But it is impossible to read the history of that disastrous period with calmness and candor, without being convinced that all the substantial grievances of the nation were removed, and that amply adequate mounds were established to guard against a recurrence of them before a single soldier was raised, a single drop of blood was shed, or a single step taken towards civil war or rebellion. In no country whatever, was liberty more adequately secured, than it was by the laws enacted from the commencement of the Long Parliament in November, 1640, till February, 1642. With every demand of Parliament during that period, Charles complied; sometimes, it is true, very reluctantly, and with an ill grace. But until they claimed a right to exercise the power over the militia, which would have been a virtual abandonment of the most important item of the regal authority, he had refused nothing.

The English, nevertheless, took up arms. Civil war spread its horrors over the nation, with its hideous train of demoralization and devastation. Torrents of blood were shed, conflagration, rape, rapine, and murder, were most frequent; the foundations of society were shaken, and the melancholy result was, to place the sceptre in the hand of Cromwell, an unprincipled, canting hypocrite; and after his death, and the unconditional restoration of Charles II., to establish passive obedience and non-resistance by an odiously positive law, under one of the most licentious and profligate monarchs that ever disgraced the throne of England. And thus the leaders of that large, and powerful, and respectable party that struggled for the liberties of the English nation, actually paved the way for a far

worse state of things than existed at the period when the contest commenced. To their intemperance, imprudence, and deficiency of political foresight, their country owed all its sufferings, under the scandalous reign of Charles II., the very worst of the despicable race of the Stuarts. Had they stopped short when they drew the teeth, and pared the nails of despotism—when they traced the strong line of demarcation on one side, and anarchy on the other, they would have deserved eternal remembrance, and have conferred lasting and inestimable blessings on their country. Their improvidence places at their doors all the havoc and ruin, the demoralization and destruction of seven years' war, the failure of a noble experiment in favor of the rights of human nature, as well as the triumph they afforded to the friends of absolute power, by the odious abuse of liberty.—These stains can never be washed away.

What, nevertheless, has been the result as to the actors on this stage ?

They are regarded to this day with the highest veneration, by the most enlightened part of mankind. Their numerous follies, their vices, their crimes, are buried in oblivion. Their resistance to lawless tyranny has immortalized them.

The Irish, at the same period, suffered almost every species of the most grinding, abominable, and revolting despotism that can be conceived. They were subject to heavy penalties for worshiping God according to the dictates of their consciences, or for not attending on a worship which they believed heretical ; they were robbed of their estates by highhanded and flagitious tyranny and fraud ; they were subject to martial law with all its horrors, in time of profound peace ; their juries were ruinously fined and mutilated in their persons, for not finding verdicts against the plainest dictates of justice ; their churches were demolished or rapaciously seized by their oppressors ; their children were torn from their actual guardians, and transferred to the care of worthless strangers, who squandered their estates, and brought them up in habits of licentiousness ; in a word, it is difficult to conceive of any species of oppression which they did not endure.

They were goaded into insurrection. And if ever resistance of lawless outrage and tyranny were loudly and imperiously called for—if ever the standard of freedom claimed the sympathies of mankind, the Irish standard had an indisputable title to it. And what has been the result ? Their most illustrious families were reduced to beggary ; their estates, to the amount of millions of acres, were confiscated ; above half a million of the natives were slaughtered, banished, or perished by famine and plague, the consequences of the ruthless and savage ferocity with which they were pursued by their enemies. They were covered with obloquy and abuse during their lives ; their memory has been detested ; and the crimes falsely alleged against them have been visited upon their descendants to the fourth and fifth generation, in the odious form of the vile code of laws " to prevent the growth of Popery."

The monstrous, absurd, improbable, and impossible legend of the massacre of 1641, I shall fully investigate in a future chapter. I now confine myself to the simple circumstance of the insurrection itself, divested of all its horrors, real or pretended.—And I dare aver, that if ever, from the creation of the world, there was a holy, sacred insurrection—an insurrection warranted by every law, divine or human, this was pre-eminently justified. Further, if the leaders of the Irish insurgents, who attempted to emancipate themselves from the tyranny of England, were traitors and rebels, then were William Tell, Maurice, Prince of Orange, Pym, Hambden, and Sydney, traitors and rebels.—One step further : If these Irishmen were traitors and rebels, Randolph, Henry, Hancock, Adams, Dickinson, Livingston, Lee, Rutledge, Clinton, and Washington himself, were traitors and rebels ; and not merely traitors and rebels, but traitors and rebels of the most atrocious kind, as the difference between the grievances that Washington and his illustrious compeers rose to redress, and those under which Ireland groaned, is very nearly as great as that between the liberty and happiness of an American citizen and the abject subjects of Turkish despotism. Indeed, if the Irish insurgents were traitors and rebels, then every man,

in every age and country, without a single exception, who ever dared to raise his arm against oppression, was a traitor and rebel.

This is strong language, which will doubtless be in direct hostility with the prejudices of a large portion of my readers.—From their prejudices, I appeal to their reason and candor; and if the decision be made by these respectable arbiters, I feel no doubt about the issue. For, to confine myself to the American Revolution, will any man, not lost to decency and common sense, dare to commit himself by comparing the grievances of America with those of Ireland ?—*a three-penny tax on tea*, with the court of Wards, the Star Chamber, the High Commission Court, the flagrant plunder of half the Province of Ulster, the rapine perpetrated in the Province of Connaught, the persecution of their religion, the seizure of their churches, the banishment of their priests, the restriction of their trade, the execution of martial law; in a word, the endless detail of the most grievous oppressions on record ? If, then, the despotic and lawless imposition of a paltry tax on tea, warranted the subject in drawing the sword, and commencing a civil war, surely the oppressions of Ireland warranted it inexpressibly more. *Indeed, it may be averred, and the decision submitted to any bar of enlightened men in Christendom, that were all the oppressions suffered by the American Provinces, from the first landing of the Pilgrims to the Declaration of Independence, aggregated into one solid mass, and all the oppressions of England under the Stuarts, thrown in to swell the amount, they would not equal the grievances suffered by the Irish during the reigns of James I., and Charles I.* And it is moreover, hardly possible to find in the history of Ireland, from the invasion of Henry II., *till the Union*, any five consecutive years, in which the Irish had not greater ground for insurrection and resistance to the English Government, than England could plead in 1688, or America in 1775 or '76.

MASSACRE OF THE PROTESTANTS.

"Falshood and fraud grow up in every soil,
The product of all climes."—ADDISON.

In order to proceed correctly in this investigation, I shall let the accusers narrate their own tales, in order to ascertain what is the sum and substance of the allegations:

"The dopopulation in this Province of Munster, do well near equal those of the whole Kingdom."

"There being, since the rebellion first broke out, unto the time of the cessation made the 15th September, 1643, which was not full two years after, above 300,000 British and Protestants cruelly murdered in cold blood, destroyed some other way, or expelled out of their habitations according to the strictest conjectures and computation of those who seemed best to understand the members of English planted in Ireland, besides those which fell in the heat of the fight during the war."—*Temple.*

"Above 154,000 Protestants were massacred in that Kingdom from the 23rd October to the 1st March following."—*Rapien.*

"By some computations, those who perished by all these cruelties, are supposed to be 150, or 200,000. By the most moderate, and probably the most reasonable account, they are made to amount to 40,000! if this extenuation itself be not, as is usual in such cases, somewhat exaggerated."—*Hume.*

"A general insurrection of the Irish spread itself over the whole country in such an inhuman and barbarous manner, that there were 40 or 50,000 of the English Protestants murdered, before they suspected themselves to be in any danger, or could provide for their defence by drawing together into towns or strongholds."—*Clarendon.*

That "Saul slew his thousands, and David his tens of thousands," was in the "olden time," sung by the women of Israel. Every Philistine was magnified into ten, every ten into a hundred, and every hundred into a thousand. But the amplifying

powers of the Jewish women falls into insignificance when compared with those of the Anglo-Hibernian victims. Every Englishman that fell in battle or otherwise, was murdered. Every man was magnified into a hundred, every ten into a thousand, and every hundred into ten thousand.

Such a spirit of exaggeration has prevailed, in a greater or less degree, in all ages. Even in common occurrences, hardly calculated to excite any interest, we find every day of our lives that the statements of current events are so highly colored as to differ full as much from the reality as the countenance of a meretricious courtezan who has exhausted her stores of carmine and white-lead, differs from the undisguised countenance of an innocent country damsel, who depends wholly upon the pure ornaments of benificent nature. This being undeniably the case on topics where no temptation to deception exists, how dreadful must be the falsehood and delusion in the present case, where ambition, avarice, malice, bigotry, national hatred, and all other dire passions that assimilate men to demons were goaded into activity!

In all other cases but that of the history of Ireland, to convict a witness of gross, palpable, and notorious falsehood, would be sufficient to invalidate the whole of his evidence; but such has been the wayward fate of that country, that the most gross and manifest forgeries, which carry their own condemnation with them, are received by the world as though they were

"Confirmations strong as proofs of holy writ,"

or, when some are found too monstrous to be admitted, their falsehood and absurdity do not impair the public credulity in the rest of the tales depending on the same authority.

The materials for Irish statistics, at that early period, are rare: a deficiency which involves this subject in considerable difficulty. Were correct tables of the population of Ireland to be had, the task would be comparatively easy, and I could put down all those tales with as much ease as I have stamped the seal of flagrant falsehood on the many impostures already investigated.

But I avail myself of a sound rule—to employ the best evidence that the nature and circumstance of the case will admit; and there are some important data on which to reason, in the present instance, and to shed the light of truth on this intricate question, and dispel the dense clouds with which it has been environed by fraud and imposture.

Sir William Petty, the ancestor of the Landsdowne family, laid the foundation of a princely fortune, in the depredations perpetrated on the Irish after the insurrection of 1641. See page —— Of course he had no temptation to swerve from the truth in their favor; on the contrary, it was his interest, equally with the other possessors of the estates of the plundered Irish, to exaggerate their real crimes, and to lend the countenance of his reputation to their pretended ones. Hence his testimony, on this ground, so far as it tends to exonerate those upon whose ruin he raised his immense estate, cannot be excepted to by the enemies of the Irish. I shall, therefore, freely cite him in the case, and the reader will at once perceive to what an extent delusion has been carried on this subject.

He states the aggregate number of the population who perished in eleven years, to have been 112,000, of whom "two-thirds were cut off by war, plague, and famine." It is obvious to the meanest capacity, that if of 112,000, the whole number that fell in that space of time, "two-thirds were cut off by war, plague, and famine," that those who fell otherwise during the same period, were only 37,000. I hope to prove that even this statement, so comparatively moderate, is extravagantly beyond the truth.

Sir William Petty confutes himself beyond the power of redemption. "Mark how a plain tale shall put him down."

He bequeathed to posterity some statistical tables which throw some light upon this subject. They are very meagre, it is true; but meagre as they are, I believe there are no others—at all events, I know of none, and must therefore avail myself of them.

He informs us that the population in 1641, was 1,465,600, and that the relative proportions of the Protestants to the Catholics,

were as two to eleven*; of course it follows that the population was thus divided, 1,241,000 Roman Catholics, and 225,000 Protestants. From this conclusion there is no appeal!!!

The supplies of people from England and Scotland until after the final defeat, capture, condemnation, and death of Charles I., were inconsiderable,† and surely it is impossible for a rational being to believe, that out of 225,000, there could have been 112,000 destroyed, and the residue been able to baffle and defeat the insurgents who comprised the great mass of the nation. It will, therefore, I trust, be allowed, as an irresistible conclusion, that Sir William Petty's calculation, although so far, more moderate than any of the "tales of terror" quoted at the commencement of this chapter, is most extravagantly over-rated, probably trebled or quadrupled, and must, of absolute necessity, be false.

But even admitting it to be correct, what an immense difference between 37,000 in eleven years, and the numbers so confidently stated by the various writers of Irish history? What astonishment must be excited by Burton's 300,000 in a few months; Temple's 30,000 in less than two years; May's 200,000 in one month; Warwick's 100,000 in one week; or Rapier's 40,000 in a few days? or the following outrageous statement from Milton's second edition of his Iconoclastes: "The rebellion and horrid massacre of English Protestants in Ireland, to the amount of 154,000 in the Province of Ulster only, by their own computation, which added to the other three, makes up the total sum of that slaughter, in all likelihood, four times as great."

Surely, there is not in the history of the world, any parallel case of such gross, palpable, shocking, and abominable deception. Can language be found strong or bold enough to mark the dishonor of those who, knowingly, propagated such falsehoods, or

---

* For the present I admit this proportion; as however exaggerated the number of the Protestants may be, it does not affect the point at issue. But from various circumstances, it is doubtful whether there was one Protestant to eleven Catholics.

† More Protestants, it is highly probable, removed from Ireland during the progress of the war, than the number of soldiers sent thither from England.

the folly or neglect of those who adopted and gave them currency? Their names ought to be held up as "a hissing reproach," to deter others from following in their foul and loathsome track of calumny and deception.

On the subject of the number of the victims of the pretended massacre, the observations of Carte are so judicious and unanswerable, that they would be sufficient, independent of the other evidence I have produced, to put down forever those miserable legends about so many hundreds of thousands of the Protestants cut off in a few weeks, or months, or years, and to stamp on the foreheads of their authors, the broad seal of imposture. He states that the extravagant numbers asserted to be massacred, were "*more than there were of English at that time in Ireland.*"

"It is certain that the great body of the English was settled in Munster and Leinster, where few murders were committed; and that in Ulster, which was the dismal scene of the massacre, there were above 10,000 Scots who had settled in great numbers in the counties of Down and Antrim; and new shoals of them had come over upon the plantations of the six escheated counties; and they were so powerful therein, that the Irish, either out of fear of their numbers, or some other politic reason, spared those of that nation, making proclamation, on pain of death, that no Scotsman should be molested, in body, goods, or lands, whilst they raged with so much cruelty against the English."—*Carte.*

To these facts he adds the following reflections: "It cannot, therefore, reasonably be presumed, that there were at most above 20,000 English souls, of all ages and sexes in Ulster at that time; and of these, as appears by the Lord Justices' letter, there were many thousands got safe to Dublin, and were subsisted there for many months afterwards; besides 6,000 women and children, which Captain Mervyn saved in Fermanagh; and others got safe to Derry, Coleraine, and Carrickfergus, and went from thence and other parts into England."—*Ib.*

It is impossible to reconcile the latter part of these quotations with the rest—a case, as we have repeatedly stated, that incessantly occurs in Irish histories. The author informs us, on ra-

tional grounds, that there were "not more than 20,000 English in Ulster;" that "several thousands got safe to Dublin;" that "6,000 women and children were saved in Fermanagh;" and that "others got safe to Derry, Coleraine, and Carrickfergus." These all-important and conclusive facts he connects with a statement of "the extreme cruelty with which the insurgents raged against the English," and with a notice of the "dismal scene of the massacre," the subjects of which massacre are not very easily found, and at all events, could not have been very numerous; for let us add together "several thousands," and "6,000," and the "others" who "got safe" into the places specified, which were garrisoned; where, of course, in a time of violence and commotion, the inhabitants of the circumjacent country would naturally seek refuge, and where it is not extravagant to suppose, that "the others" who thus "got safe," might have amounted to some thousands; let us then deduct the aggregate from 20,000, the total number of the English, and we shall find a slender remainder. But the plain fact is, that the writers on this subject are so haunted by the idea of massacre, that although it rests on the sandy foundation of forgery and perjury, as shall be fully proved in the sequel; and although many of their own statements, in the most unequivocal manner, give it the lie direct, their minds cannot be divested of the terrific object. These passages from Carte, furnish a strong case in point. The most ardent friend of Ireland could not desire a much more complete proof of the fallacy of the accounts of the pretended massacre, than is here given by this author himself, who, nevertheless, wonderful to tell! appears to resist the evidence of his own facts, and to be blind to the obvious inference to which they inevitably lead.

Ferdinand Warner, a clergyman of the Church of England, appears to have been the only writer who has gone into any elaborate investigation of the legendary tales of the pretended massacre, and his views of the subject well deserve the most serious attention of the reader. After stating the uncertainty of the accounts, and the consequent difficulty of making an exact

estimate, he pronounces a strong and unequivocal sentence of condemnation on the Munchausen tales we are combating; and avers that "*It is easy enough to demonstrate the falsehood of the relation of every Protestant Historian of this Rebellion.*" He proceeds to render a satisfactory account of the grounds on which this statement rests: "To any one who considers how thinly Ireland was at that time peopled by Protestants, and the Province of Ulster particularly, where was the chief scene of the massacre, those relations upon the face of them, appear incredible."

"Setting aside all opinions and calculations in this affair, which, besides their uncertainty, are, without any precision as to the space of time in which the murders were committed, the evidence from the depositions in the MS above-mentioned, stands thus: The number of people killed, upon positive evidence collected in two years after the insurrection broke out, adding them all together, amounts only to *two thousand one hundred and nine;* on the reports of other Protestants, *one thousand six hundred and nineteen* more; and on the reports of some of the rebels themselves, a further number of *three hundred*, making in the whole *four thousand and twenty-eight.* Besides these murders, there is in the same collection, evidence on the report of others, of *eight thousand* killed by ill usage; and if we should allow that the cruelties of the Irish out of war, extended to these numbers, which, considering the nature of the several of the depositions, I think in my *conscience* we cannot, yet to be impartial, we must allow that there is no pretence for laying a greater number to their charge. This account is also corroborated by a letter which I copied out of the Council books of Dublin, written on the 5th May, 1652, ten years after the beginning of the rebellion, from the Parliamentary Commissioners in Ireland to the English Parliament. After citing them to further severity against the Irish, as being afraid, 'their behavior towards the people may never sufficiently avenge their murders and massacres,' the Commissioners tell them that it appears, 'besides eight hundred and forty-eight families, there were killed, hanged, burned, and drowned,

six thousand and sixty-two.' "—*History of the Rebellion and Civil War of Ireland, by Ferdinand Wood.* 4to. London, 1768.

This Reverend author further says: "So many of their sayings which are recorded in the MS collection of depositions in my custody, are *so ridiculous, or incredible, or contradictory to one another*, as show plainly that they spoke what their own, or the different passions and sentiments of their leaders prompted; sometimes, what came uppermost, or they thought, would best serve or vindicate their cause."

"There is no credit to be given to anything that was said by those people, which had not other evidence to confirm it; and the reason why so many idle, silly tales were registered, of what this body heard another body say, as to swell the collection to two and thirty thick volumes in folio, closely written, it is easier to conjecture than it is to commend."

"The bulk of this immense collection, is paid evidence, and upon report of common fame; and what sort of evidence that is, may be easily learnt by those who are conversant with the common people of any country, especially when their imaginations are terrified with cruelties, and their passions heated by sufferings."

Authorities enough have been cited, to prove to every unprejudiced mind, that the massacre of the Protestants in Ulster, was by no means to any great extent, and that it has been grossly and wilfully magnified by the enemies of the Catholics of Ireland. Wrongs upon wrongs have, indeed, been heaped upon that unhappy country; but I hope and trust, that the day is now dawning when tardy justice will be done her, and THE WRONGS OF IRELAND BE NO MORE.

FINIS.

Rec'd April 20. 1850.

THE WRONGS OF IRELAND,

FROM

THE INVASION OF HENRY II.

BY

S. W. PALMER.

Published by the Author.

NEW-YORK:

CASPER C. CHILDS, PRINTER, No. 80 VESEY STREET.

1850.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 342 162 1